

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #1421/01 2111009
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 301009Z JUL 07
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9913
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 001421

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)
NSC FOR LEDDY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)

SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP-UP FOR THE
PERIOD JULY 16-27

This is CWC-68-07.

INSPECTION ISSUES - SEQUENTIALS AND SAMPLING & ANALYSIS

¶1. (U) On July 23, del rep met with Bill Kane (Head, Industry Verification, Technical Secretariat) and Jorge Bernal Ramirez (IVB), who works closely with the TS mission planners.

¶2. (U) The first topic was lessons learned from the recent sequential inspections that were held at a Schedule 3 and a UDOC plant sites in Ohio. The following issues were addressed:

¶3. (U) First, at the commencement of these inspections, the inspection team leader (ITL) insisted on presenting the mandates for both inspection sites at the time of the equipment inspection (TEI) in Washington. This did not raise a real issue, as the host team facilitated the arrival of the inspection in the "vicinity" of both inspection sites upon arrival in Ohio, as the sites were located close together. The discussion was how this might be handled if the sites were further apart (e.g., up to the 150-mile limit allowed under the U.S. consent to host sequential inspections). Kane admitted that this was addressed specifically before with any other States Party. He committed to exploring this further with his staff and letting us know their thoughts.

¶4. (U) Second, although this was not an issue during these inspections, the host team wondered if it would be preferable for the ITL to carry the sealed mandate and other items for the second inspection site with him at least through airport security when traveling from the POE to the vicinity of the sites. This would allow the ITL to oversee any need for TSA personnel to open the sealed envelope for security reasons. Kane thought this was a good recommendation and committed to discussing this further with his staff.

¶5. (U) Finally, Kane also said that sequential inspections were again on the TS radar. Kane made a similar statement to del rep a month or two before the July sequential inspections occurred.

¶6. (U) The possible timing of the anticipated Schedule 2 inspection involving sampling and analysis (S&A) was discussed briefly. Although del rep was not requesting specific information about the timing of this event, he did bring to the attention of the TS representatives coordination concerns that were recently identified - that the Edgewood mobile laboratory staff who would support an S&A event (i.e., provide the needed portable fume hood) include staff who would also be involved in the October proficiency test activities for the designated laboratory. Kane was able to clarify the following:

-- The proficiency test activities would occur during the weeks of October 8 and 15.

-- They would work to ensure that there is no conflict.

-- He asked whether an S&A inspection during either the week immediately prior to or immediately after could be supported, which del rep confirmed. Given that there have been rumors that this S&A inspection might occur in October, Kane may have given us two specific windows to focus on with this question.

INDUSTRY CLUSTER - LATE DECLARATIONS

¶7. (U) As a result of the July 10 consultation on this issue, the facilitator (Larry Denyer, U.S.) has worked with the TS, ISN/CB, and Commerce/TCD to revise the previous facilitator's draft decision to incorporate the strong opinions expressed by delegations and to try to preserve as much of the heart of the decision as possible, with a view to returning to the possibility of additional measures (including "nil"

declarations) in the future.

¶8. (U) Given that some of the greatest concern about the previous draft (along with suggestions for modifying it) came from the South African delegation, the facilitator met with the South African delegate to discuss the proposed changes. The result was very positive. The South African delegate even went so far as to offer his assistance, if needed, in brokering an agreement with some of the interested (and difficult) SPs within his regional group and the NAM - i.e., Iran, India, etc.

¶9. (U) The latest draft has now been forwarded to the TS for their distribution to delegations and posting on the external server. This will give delegations nearly six weeks to consult with their capitals in advance of the September Industry Cluster meetings. The facilitator will continue to meet with interested delegations in the intervening period to try to make progress toward a decision at EC-50.

¶10. (U) Ito sends.
GALLAGHER